DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 023 HE 007 839

AUTHOR Clark, Michael C.
TITLE Systematic Curriculum and Program Deveopment (C&PD) at Saint John.s University: An Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Saint John's Univ., Collegeville, Minn.
SPONS AGENCY Ober Charitable Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 73p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Church Related Colleges; Cost Effectiveness; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Planning; Data Collection, Faculty Evaluation; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Opinion; Systems Approach
IDENTIFIERS *Saint Johns University

ABSTRACT

The development and implementation of Saint John's Curriculum and Program Development (C&PD) is reported. The C&PD program is an educational development program in which faculty members, either singly or in groups, prepare proposals for projects or programs they would like to conduct. Each project or program must be related to instructional activities and/or the instructional mission of the university and must have provisions for evaluation. Each must have the capability of becoming self-sustaining if successful. Programs may be funded for one, two, or three years. Guidelines for funding are outlined, along with a formative evaluation plan. The evaluation consists of three components: (1) bringing in a team of evaluation consultants; (2) collecting data on campus awareness, knowledge, and perceptions of the C&PD program; and (3) examining evaluative data on individual projects in the context of the program as a whole. Recommendations of the evaluation team are reviewed regarding increased program management, better definition and refinement of policy and guidelines which govern the program, improvement of program operations, clarification of university commitment to the C&PD program, publicity, and name change. Questionnaire results indicate a very high agreement among faculty with the program's purposes but a less high evaluation of the program's effectiveness. Appendices include a listing of projects funded by the C&PD program, 1974-76. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124023

SYSTEMATIC CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (C & PD) AT SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY: AN EVALUATION REPORT

MICHAL C. CLARK
SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A report submitted to the Ober Charitable Foundation in accordance with requirements of their grant.

March 1, 1976

HE007839

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

The C & PD Program 2

Brief History of the Program 4

Evaluation Plan. 10

Evaluation Results 12

Conclusions. 18

Appendices

A. Projects Funded by C & PD Program - 1974-76.20

B. C & PD Questionnaire and Results. 27

C. Evaluation team member's reports. 36

D. 1976-77 Project Application Materials . . . 59

SYSTEMATIC CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT (C & PD) AT SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
AN EVALUATION REPORT

Several years ago Saint John's University became eager to develop a systematic approach to curriculum and program development (C & PD) which would, in an ongoing manner, tap the entire University community for curricular and program ideas to meet the needs of changing times. We feel that the stresses, both internal and external, placed on today's liberal arts college demand a coherent response from the college if the college is to survive. We must have the capability of developing new programs and improving existing programs within today's inflationary economy and steady state enrollment characteristics.

After examining major existing models for advancing curricular change in higher education, we found the two most traditional models to be unacceptable. The first, an ad hoc, unsystematic curricular evolvement tends to be sporadic and suggests reaction more than continuous planning and action. The second, a major overhaul every ten or twelve years, may be even less desirable, for the challenges facing higher education do not come in such cycles. Neither model provides any assurances with respect to quality control or evaluation of its product.

Our C & PD Program provides the vehicle for advancing curricular and program improvement at Saint John's University. Our approach is somewhat analagous to the research and development function in many advanced industrial corporations and in a few major universities. The C & PD program has been expending $100,000 per year to facilitate educational development on the campus. Initiation of the program has been made possible through grants from the Ober and Butler Charitable Foundations.

The program will continue to operate at this $100,000 per year level of funding for three more years. Then, our plan is to continue funding the program at the level of approximately 5% of the academic salary budget. Thus, the program for educational development, instructional program development and curricular change should become self-sustaining.

This report will briefly summarize C & PD activities to date. It will then present the findings of a recently conducted evaluation of the C & PD program and its over-all impact on Saint John's. It will conclude by discussing our future directions with the program.

THE C & PD PROGRAM

The C & PD Program is an educational development program. Faculty members-- either singly or in groups--prepare proposals for projects or programs they would like to conduct. Each project or program must be related to instructional activities and/or the instructional mission of the university. Each project must have provisions for evaluation. Each project or program must have the capability of becoming self-sustaining if successful. Programs may be funded for one, two or three years.

The proposals are reviewed by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee--a group partly elected, partly appointed which has faculty, staff and student representatives. The AAAC makes funding decisions--both the decision of which proposals are to be funded and the level at which each is to be funded. The program is administered through the office of the Academic Vice President by an appointed Coordinator of the C & PD Program.

Specific details about the program are perhaps best given in the following

guidelines for the C & PD Program which have recently been distributed to faculty as they are preparing proposals for 1976-77 funding:

Guidelines for C & PD Funding - 1976-77

The essence of the C & PD Program is to enable the university to respond to new curriculum and Program proposals as promptly as possible. The program can fund educational development proposals which aim to improve academic quality and/or to increase productivity in the teaching-learning process.

Two major goals of the program are:

1.) to support innovative or new programs which have potential promise for the University and

2.) to encourage relevant and responsible experimentation in liberal studies oriented education.

For 1976-77 funding consideration the following specific details apply:

1. A C & PD Grant Application form must be submitted to the Academic Vice President's office by March 10, 1976. Completion of the application form replaces the writing of a proposal. Application forms are available from Fr. Gunther's office and from Michal Clark's office.(S.L. 213-B).

2. Applicants are encouraged to read "The Guide for Writing Proposals" available from Lee Hanley in the Communications office(Q149). Helpful proposal writing resources are available in the Communications office(Q149) and the C & PD Coordinator's office(S.L. 213-B) for your use.

3. Projects may be supported by C & PD funds for 1, 2 and 3 years. If you request multiple year funding, your application form should describe first year activities in detail and it should also outline second and third year budgets.

4. Funding decisions will be made by the Academic Affairs Advisory Council. The AAAC will select projects to be funded and will make decisions on the total funding for each funded project.

5. The Academic Vice President will announce the awarding of funds by mid-April.

6. The following criteria will be considered by AAAC in reaching funding decisions:

   a.) The project must address some educationally relevant need;

   b.) The project must be capable of becoming self-sustaining after C & PD funding of it has terminated;

4

c.) The project must be innovative or experimental(It need not be so in an absolute sense, but it should be a new step forward in the proposed area on our campus.);

d.) Projects which relate to some aspect of the University's developing liberal studies program will be given top priority;

e.) Projects which contribute to systematic development of a promising program will be given priority;

f.) Application forms should be as specific as possible in describing the proposed project, its implementation and its evaluation.

7. The following information is relevant to your project's budget:

a.) Faculty are paid $1,000 per month for summer work(This figure could be revised, but such revision would have to be made by AAAC.);

b.) Other personnel are to be budgeted at current rates;

c.) You should be realistic in your budgeting;

d.) Once AAAC has negotiated your total project budget, the project director can revise the budget(remaining within the project total) to assure the most effective use of funds.

More specific details of the C & PD program are described in the next section.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

A proposal requesting funds to start the C & PD program was prepared by Dr. O.W. Perlmutter, then Academic Vice President at Saint John's, and submitted to the Ober Charitable Foundation in March of 1973. Funding was secured in late 1973. The Ober Foundation is providing funding for the first five years of C & PD activity. Their contribution provided 50% of the C & PD Program funds for the first year and 40% for the second year. The Ober funds will continue for three more years on a similarly decreasing basis. The Butler Charitable Foundation has also provided funds for the first two years of the program and will continue to support it for the next three years also. Saint John's University has provided the remainder of the program's funds. This funding pattern is resulting in the University's share of the funding

responsibility increasing each year until in the sixth year, the C & PD program will be 100% University funded. The external funding has made it possible for the university to assume the cost of the program in a way which is much more affordable and more in line with university budgeting procedures than simply adding a costly new program to the university budget.

In the Spring of 1974 the university community was informed of the C & PD Programs actual existence and proposals were solicited from the faculty. A total of thirteen proposals were received. The AAAC funded nine of them. Appendix A describes the projects and programs which were funded for the 1974-75 year and the level at which they were funded. The program was being administered by Dr. O.W. Perlmutter, the Academic Vice President. Work on the individual projects and programs began during the summer of 1974.

Also, during the 1974-75 school year Saint John's University attempted to initiate a Learning Resources Center(LRC). Dr. Perlmutter's administrative plan for the C & PD Program called for the LRC to monitor the progress of the individual C & PD projects and report the findings to his office and the AAAC. The plan was sound. Unfortunately, the LRC never really got off of the ground. Even more unfortunately, Dr. Perlmutter was stricken with a terminal illness. A period of confusion with regard to C & PD administration resulted.

By March of 1975, Fr. Gunther Rolfson, O.S.B., was appointed acting Academic Vice President, and he appointed Dr. Michal Clark to coordinate the C & PD program. At this point, three of the nine 1974-75 C & PD projects had not really begun. It was decided to postpone the start of the International Administration Program for one year and to scrap the Program of Administration and the Benedictine Studies Project entirely. It was also decided that funds originally committed to these projects should be reallocated to projects which could be completed on/or about September 1, 1975. Thus, as proposals

were solicited from the faculty, better than $130,000 of funds were available for disbursement. These funds went to support proposals in two categories: about $ 30,000 for interim projects from reallocated funds; and about $100,000 for 1975-76 projects.

As a consequence of our difficulties in starting up and administering a smoothly operating educational development program, we felt that in the Spring of 1975 the C & PD Program was suffering from a lack of faculty confidence. Consequently, the program director with support from the Academic Vice President and the AAAC decided that the programatic and self-sufficiency aspects of the guidelines should be interpreted somewhat liberally for the impending round of proposal review and funding. This decision resulted in a large number of small, not overly programatic, but, nonetheless, promising proposals to be funded. The AAAC received 32 proposals for consideration for interim and 1975-76 funding. Decisions were made to fund 22 of these proposals. Appendix A presents descriptions of the interim projects which were funded and of the 1975-76 projects which were funded.

We feel as though the laxity in our application of our guidelines paid off. As a result of the funding decisions made in 1975, a far larger proportion of our faculty became directly involved in C & PD projects. As of now, at least 26 different faculty members have worked on C & PD projects. The following evaluation results will add support to demonstrate that be Fall, 1975, the C & PD Program was viewed positively by the faculty.

As of this date, all 1975-76 projects have either been completed or are making progress toward the achievement of their objectives. We are once again at the point of soliciting proposals from faculty. During April, 1976-77 funding decisions will be made and announced. These decisions will reflect a return to more programatic and potentially self-sustaining projects. We are taking the findings of last fall's evaluation efforts seriously.

Specific and anticipated changes to be made as a result of the evaluation data will be discussed in the Conclusion section of this report.

At this point, it seems reasonable to list some of the concrete benefits which have been accrued from C & PD projects during the first two years of the program. While this list is neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, it does indicate some true improvements in university instructional programs as a direct result of C & PD activity.

The project dealing with systematic improvement of introductory biology instruction has definitely improved laboratory instruction in the introductory course for all students who take that course. In 1974-75 we found that students who were in the "experimental" laboratory section did statistically significantly better in both laboratory and lecture-related tests in the course. The students in the experimental lab(development of which is a C & PD project) performed on an average of 8% better in lab and lecture work than those in the traditional lab sections. For 1975-76 the new lab was implemented for the entire course--about 380 students. We are finding that this year's students are all performing about at the level of last years "experimental" group. Thus, the C & PD project has resulted in a significantly improved instructional experience. It is also worth noting that the staff of this project have now developed their own lab manual which is used in the course and intend to publish appropriate professional papers describing their developmental work and its results.

The research projects in field biology have provided several students with truly exciting field research experiences. These undergraduate research efforts have resulted in sets of publishable data. Most noteworthy about this project is that after a successful C & PD funding experience, it has received funding from the National Science Foundation.

The Program of International Administration has started. Saint John's University now offers this program to students who are interested in careers

with international business concerns. It is too early to assess the program's impact, but it does exist and has several excited students participating in it. This program's existance is entirely due to C & PD support.

The project on American Social Responsibility resulted in the offering of a program entitled "Images of Man" during our 1976 January Term. The "Images of Man" course was clearly the highlight of the interim term. The course was evaluated in detail and shows tremendous promise for the future. It is worth noting that development of intellectually exciting interim courses is a major problem on our campus, and this C & PD supported effort represents a major step forward.

Another project allowed the History Department to develop a slide library so that visual materials could more readily be incorporated into their courses. The slide library now contains over 1,000 catalogued slides. Every teacher in the department has made a commitment to continue enlarging their library.

The project on rural ministry has already resulted in one course(another may be forthcoming) being added to the curriculum. This course relates to empirically established needs of rural clergy. The course is quite consistant with development of an emphasis on rural studies for some students in the school of divinity.

After surmounting some unanticipated technological difficulties the project which is acquiring videotapes for the Foreign Language Department is resulting in a significant instructional resource. Under C & PD funding the project has begun to acquire a variety of educational and popular network television show videotapes in the German language. The department is sufficiently impressed with the benefits to instruction that they have already begun to make arrangements to get tapes in Spanish and French also. This project is more than simply an acquisition of materials in that it also has supported the integration of the use of the tapes into courses.

The projects to improve the teaching of the history of mathematics have resulted in the development of a series of "guided reading" mini-courses. Several students take these mini-courses each semester. Without the C & PD developed mini-courses, this area of study would not be available to our students.

The project to improve elementary science methods has resulted in substantial improvement in a regularly offered course. The course has been modernized to allow more individualization and to provide a curriculum more appropriate for elementary education students. As a result of this C & PD project, our elementary education students are being better prepared to teach science.

The projects on the computer have resulted in readily available access to a computer system for our students. Without this C & PD funded project we would be unable to provide our students with the amount of or the quality of computer access which they have. Any Saint John's student now has ample opportunity to learn how to use a computer and adequate access to be able to use the computer as a learning and problem solving tool.

The project on Religious Education has produced a list of competencies which are aimed at helping any person involved in youth ministry, adult education, classroom religion teaching or other aspects of faith development. These competence statements have affected several courses on compus. More notably, the list is being incorporated into the National Cathechetical Directory, an official document of the U.S. Catholic Conference which contains norms and guidelines for all aspects of reaching religion.

We think that these results from C & PD projects have already had a positive impact on Saint John's, and that they are indicative of the C & PD Program producing significant positive effects for the university as a whole. However, the question of a program's impact requires a more complex answer than a simple listing of some accrued benefits. As a consequence of the

desire to assess the program's overall impact and the requirements of the funding agreement with the Ober Foundation to do so, In the Fall, 1975 we conducted a formative evaluation study of the C & PD Program. It must be noted that his evaluation focused on the program as a whole and did not attempt to assess results or impacts of individual projects.

EVALUATION PLAN

A formative evaluation of the C & PD Program was conducted in the Fall, 1975.

This evaluation focuses on the impact of the C & PD Program on the university. It specifically did not emphasize evaluating individual projects even though some information about the various projects may be gathered.

The evaluation had two major goals:

1. To assess the status of the C & PD Program, the impact which the program is having, and the significance of the program to the university.

2. To suggest revisions, modifications, amendments, etc. to the C & PD Program and its related procedures so as to maximize impact and significance to the university during the next five years.

The results of the evaluation are to be used for both immediate and long range planning purposes. The tactics of the evaluation are presented below. The findings are discussed in the next section. Our immediate reactions and uses of the data are described in the concluding section of this report.

There were three major components to the evaluation: 1) bringing in a team of evaluation consultants; 2) collecting data on campus awareness, knowledge, and perceptions of the C & PD Program; and 3) examining evaluative data on individual projects in the context of the program as a whole. The basic strategy for the evaluation was for the C & PD Program staff to gather much of the information required for components 2 and 3 and make that information

available to the evaluation team. Then, we were relying upon the expertise of the evaluation team to place that information into perspective with respect to the entire program.

The evaluation team consisted of three individuals who have had experience with C & PD related programs and who have worked as evaluation consultants previously. Gordon Kingston administers a large faculty grants for educational development purposes program at a major university. He recently has gone through a thorough evaluation of his own program. Bernard Luskin has run a similarly oriented program for over seven years at his institution. He also directs planning and educational development there. He has an established record of successful evaluation consulting experiences. William Hickey is the academic vice president of a liberal arts college. He has had a variety of educational development experiences and he knows the perspective of a line administrator in a Catholic liberal arts college well. Each of the evaluators were also extremely perceptive and articulate individuals. We expected the team to assess the status of our current program and suggest modifications and future courses of action.

The evaluation team received a thorough written description of the C & PD program about two weeks prior to their mid-October visit to the campus. After they had the opportunity to review the materials, they were asked if they needed further information before coming to the campus. Their requests were answered and they indicated persons they wished to interview when they came to the campus. They spent two days on campus at which time they had access to all information they requested.

The evaluation team met with the following people: the Academic Vice President, the Vice President for Development, the Director of Communications (who also coordinates grant writing), the Coordinator of the C & PD Program, fifteen faculty members who have worked on C & PD projects, representatives

from the AAAC, several students who have been affected by C & PD projects, several faculty and staff members who have not worked on C & PD projects and the President's assistant. Fr. Michael Blecker, O.S.B., the President, was ill and could not meet with the team. They did communicate with one another after the campus visit. Thus, it seems reasonable to say that they evaluation team received considerable input in its two day visit.

After the campus visit, each consultant drafted a report directed toward the evaluative goals--one part assessing C & PD current status and impact and a second part reflecting on modifications and future directions. These reports provided formal evaluative feedback to the program, to the university, and now to the foundation. Informal feedback has occurred in a variety of meetings and conversations.

The second component of the evaluation employed a questionnaire to collect information on faculty and academic administration awareness, knowledge, and perceptions of the C & PD program. We employed a questionnaire developed by the Center for Educational Development at the University of Minnesota as a model. The questionnaire had two parts: one to be completed by all faculty and a second to be completed only by project participants. Appendix B contains copies of the questionnaire. The data from the questionnaire were collated and tabulated prior to the evaluation team's visit. The team members were given copies of the responses prior to their campus visit.

The third component of the evaluation consisted of articulating information and evaluative data from each C & PD funded project. These data were also given to the evaluation team prior to the campus visit. The comments about specific projects in the previous section have come from these data.

EVALUATION RESULTS

There are two major sets of results to our C & PD Program evaluation.

First, the findings of the evaluation team are considered. Second, the findings from the questionnaire are presented.

There are two parts to the evaluation team's findings. First, their observations about and reactions to the program are summarized. Then, their recommendations are summarized. The reports containing reactions and recommendations from each of the three evaluators are attached as Appendix C. The summaries of reactions and recommendations are presented here as lists. The interested reader can gain a far better understanding of the findings by reading the appended reports from the individual evaluators.

Members of the evaluation team tended to share the following reactions:

1. There is a positive commitment from the University leadership to the notion of planned, systematic educational change;
2. There is a high degree of support from the faculty and administration for continuation of the program;
3. There has been positive leadership exercised to date in the administration of the program; however, the program does not receive the degree of administration it needs. More time for management of the program needs to be made available;
4. There is administrative commitment to follow through with the program and commit the needed university funds to it;
5. There is a high degree of faculty awareness of the program. There is a great deal of faculty involvement in the program. However, many faculty seem vague in understanding program guidelines and policies;
6. Individual projects seem well conceived, well managed and of surprisingly uniform high quality;
7. Informed students seem very positive about the program's potential.
8. There are a variety of communications problems concerning the university's commitment to the program and concerning guidelines and requirements of the program;
9. The AAAC is definitely intended to play a major role in deciding funding patterns and practices;
10. There seems to be a lack of sufficient structure and direction especially with respect to programatic decision making.

In summary the C & PD Program has been highly successful in its first year of operation. Enthusiasm for the program is high. Benefits from the program

are real. The program is producing a positive impact on the university. However, certain "expected" problems must be dealt with in the near future. These problems are better specified by considering the evaluation team's recommendations.

The evaluation team felt that certain actions need to be taken with the program. As these actions are taken, the program should become even stronger and have a greater impact on the university. The following list summarizes the team's recommendations:

A. Increased program management

1. Clarification of the role and responsibilities of the Coordinator;
2. Clarification of the relationship between the C & PD program and university development efforts; and the relationship of the Coordinator to that relationship;
3. Definition of the relationship of the Coordinator to a program policy group(see B), to the Academic Vice President and to the President;
4. Identification of a person to assume the role of Coordinator by June 1.

B. Better definition and refinement of policy and guidelines which govern the program

1. Strengthened involvement of the AAAC or a faculty committee empowered to carry out these tasks;
2. Identification of University-wide themes to add coherence to funding patterns;
3. Precise specifications of funding selection criteria;
4. Specification of project evaluation obligations and criteria;
5. Specification of criteria for continuation and/or refunding of individual projects;
6. Establishing 2-5 so as to maximize faculty involvement but not at cost of diluting programatic efforts;
7. Clarification of pertinent decision making processess;
8. Appropriate in-house publicizing of resulting documents, policies, guidelines, etc.

C. Improvement of operations of program(from Coordinator's office)

1. Adopt a project application form which takes the place of the proposal;

2. Assistance in development of project application from the Development Office and the Coordinator's Office;

3. More extensive use by the projects of resource persons and expertise available on campus.

D. Clarification of University commitment to the C & PD program (from appropriate administrative offices)

1. Establish a financial plan for assuming continuation of the program;

2. Publicize commitment to the program and its continuation;

3. Assist successful projects in becoming self-sustaining

E. Publicity

1. On-campus
   a. "State of Program" reports
   b. Descriptions of individual projects

2. Off-campus
   a. Program as a whole
   b. Assist faculty in publishing reports of successful projects

F. Consider changing name of program to a more generic, descriptive title

The second part of the evaluation findings concern responses to the questionnaire which we sent to all faculty. The questionnaire was sent under a cover letter from the Academic Vice President. It was sent to all faculty and academic administrators. Faculty who had not worked on a C & PD project received a brief form. Those who had worked on a project received a much longer questionnaire. Both questionnaires are included in Appendix B. The results are summarized here. A detailed response tabulation is included in Appendix B.

The first finding from the questionnaire was that a high proportion of faculty and administration are aware of the program. Of those who had never worked on a C & PD project, 58% returned their questionnaires. Only 5%

had never heard of the program. 18% felt they did not fully understand the program. The other 77% felt they had a reasonable understanding of the program. Of those faculty who have never submitted a proposal, the single most important reason for non-submission was that they did not have enough time to do so.

The majority(54%) of all respondents felt that "the C & PD Program is more important than ever to help maintain the vitality of University programs through renewal and innovation." All were asked to rate their agreement with the three major purposes of the program and the current effectiveness of the program in addressing each purpose. These results are summarized below:

Purpose	Agreement		Effectiveness	
	Non-Participants	Participants	Non-Participants	Participants
1. University Responsibility Educational Improvement	4.39	4.31	3.55	3.80
2. Assure all university units of available development recourses	4.51	4.69	3.59	3.87
3. Provide for planned, systematic, open procedure for educational development	4.31	4.50	2.74	3.53

These results present mean responses on a five point scale(A response of 5 indicates "strongly agree" or "very effective".) These results show very high agreement of all faculty with the program's purposes. All faculty were less positive with respect to the program's effectiveness in achieving these purposes. However, the responses did tend toward "effective". The most interesting aspect of these data is the result that people who have worked on a C & PD project see the program as being significantly more effective in achieving the third purpose than those who have not worked on a project.

The remainder of the questionnaire results are only from those who have worked on a project. The following three factors were rated as being most important in suggesting a need for educational development:

1. Change or improvement in instructional technology;
2. Changes in departmental procedure of emphasis;
3. Increased enrollment.

The following three factors were rated as important in influencing thinking regarding the C & PD project:

1. Discussions with discipline-related colleagues;
2. Discussions with students;
3. An article in a discipline related journal.

The following three factors were rated as important in stimulating application for a C & PD project:

1. Stimulation by the announcement of C & PD fund availability;
2. Lack of available money from regular departmental resources;
3. Encouragement by administrators.

These three areas of results show the factors which have been stimulating C & PD project development.

The majority of project participant respondents (70%) felt that the C & PD grant had no effect on their standing within their departments. A great majority of respondents felt that the results of their development efforts were being used. A surprising number (44%) felt that their conception of education had changed. Respondents felt as though the probability of getting their projects funded through other sources would not have been too high.

The major limitations in the findings of this questionnaire are: 1) Only 27% of the respondents had completed the developmental aspects of their projects; and 2) Many respondents felt that it was really too early in the life of the program for a major evaluation effort.

In summary, the questionnaire results indicate that there is a high degree of awareness of the program. Faculty strongly approve of the purposes of the program. The program is seen as being moderately effective, but there is definite room for improvement. Those faculty who have worked on C & PD projects feel that their efforts have been worthwhile and in fact feel quite positive about the program.

CONCLUSIONS

The two major conclusions we have reached are: 1) the C & PD Program is having an impact on Saint John's University; and 2) the evaluation study has been helpful to us in making decisions about the C & PD program.

All of the evidence presented in this report indicates that the C & PD Program is impacting the university. Curricular change is occurring on a regular basis. Many faculty are involved in these changes. Most of the C & PD supported changes seem to be worthwhile. We have developed a program which should prove extremely successful in both anticipating the future and adjusting to its demands.

We have already begun responding to the evaluation team's recommendations. The Academic Vice President is considering increasing the amount of time made available for administering the program. The Vice President for Development and the Director of Communications have expressed a strong willingness to work closely with the C & PD Program and its coordinator.

At a more specific level funding application procedures for 1976-77 have been modified and clarified. Faculty now complete an application form requesting detailed information from them rather than the previous somewhat vague proposal preparation process. Assistance in completing the application process is available from the Development Office and from the C & PD Coordinator. More

detailed guidelines for the program were distributed. This application process should facilitate a more knowledgable, detailed review process by the AAAC. Forms and documents used in this years application process are attached in Appendix D.

The AAAC's Subcommittee on Curriculum Development is beginning a thorough review of the program. That group will then be charged with recommending a long range plan for the C & PD Program. Such a long range plan would ultimately go to the faculty for approval. This long range planning process should assist in adding specific programatic foci to the program.

We feel that the changes already made to our program and those that will result from work stimulated by the evaluation study will definitely improve the C & PD Program. We are really quite excited about the program, its successes and the directions which we anticipate that it might take. We feel that successful curricular planning and educational development programs occur infrequently in small, liberal arts colleges. We are pleased that our program is as successful as it has been.

In fact, we feel that in the coming decade the C & PD Program might well prove to be the difference between excellence and stagnation, between survival and decay. We would be most pleased at the opportunity to aid other colleges in meeting the future.

APPENDIX A

PROJECTS FUNDED BY C & PD PROGRAM - 1974-76

Contents:

Annotated list of funded
projects for each funding period.

CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA

PROJECTS FOR THE 1974-75 YEAR:

NOTE: These projects were started during the summer of 1974 and are scheduled for completion during this summer.

1. INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION* $ 19,500
Program Director--Joseph Friedrich

This program had as its goal to provide specific technical knowledge and skills necessary for overseas employment or domestic employment with firms having overseas offices.

2. PROGRAM OF ADMINISTRATION* $ 13,600
Program Director--Joseph Friedrich

This program was a general program of which the International Administration was one part. It was interdisciplinary, including several departments already in existence at Saint John's. Its goal was to provide specific technical knowledge and skills necessary for employment in public and private sectors.

3. BENEDICTINE STUDIES* $ 8,766
Program Director--Otmar Drekonja

This program was to establish a study sequence which would highlight the tradition of Benedictine life throughout the last 1500 years, create an awareness of a sense for historical perspective, and understand the ora et labora principle.

4. IMPROVEMENT OF ELEMENTARY SCIENCE METHODS $ 2,775
Program Director--Sister Margaret Van Kemper

This program provided experiences with new science curricula (i.e. ESS, SCIS, and SAPA); presented science concepts in a manner that allowed the students to allude to the process involved; allowed individualized instruction which was self-paced and performance-based; and utilized a series of modules for learning in the areas of physical, biological, and earth sciences.

5. IMPROVEMENT OF THE HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS $ 1,500
Program Director--Gerald Lenz

This program was to establish one-credit history of mathematics courses which would be taken simultaneously with almost any course in the mathematics curriculum. These one-credit courses would be "independent" studies, using "reading guides" and materials which had been prepared in each of the subject areas.

6. SYSTEMATIC IMPROVEMENT OF BIOLOGY III LABORATORY INSTRUCTION $ 1',160
Program Directors--Sister Dunstan Plantenberg, Sister Mary Grell, Ms. Billie Reaney

This program established new, innovative methods for students to gain increased laboratory experiences. It included preparation and testing of new laboratory experiences; writing laboratory manuals; setting up learning modules; and cataloging test items for laboratories and lectures.

7. RESEARCH PROJECTS IN FIELD BIOLOGY $ 5,414
Program Director--Norman Ford

This program established a series of research projects in field biology to be carried on by a principal investigator and a selected group of students. The three projects were as follows: 1) the effect of introduced conifer plantations on distribution and abundance patterns of vertebrae; 2) environmental factors affecting the hybernation behavior of the jumping mouse; 3) species interaction between the grey squirrel and the red squirrel.

8. COMPUTER ASSISTED STUDIES $ 20,650
Program Director--James Peters

This program established funds to purchase computer terminals and computer software programs for the Hewlett-Packard computers which continue to offer limitless opportunities for individualized learning to the students of Saint John's University.

9. INAUGURATION OF A LEARNING AND RESOURCE CENTER $ 8,075
Program Director--Father Gordon Tavis

This program provided funds for additional terminals and media equipment to support many of the C&PD programs as well as the other curricula on the Saint John's Campus.

10. C&PD GENERAL ADMINISTRATION $ 5,560
Program Directors--Norman James and Michal Clark

This program oversees administration of C&PD projects, monitors project activities, and works with all aspects of the program.

TOTAL ALLOCATED FOR 1974-75 YEAR $100,000

REALLOCATED FUND PROJECTS:

NOTE: Programs 1, 2, and 3 (noted by the *) of the 1974-75 Year were unable to be realized. Therefore, the programs below were later funded. Consequently, the full $100,000 of the 1974-75 C&PD funds has been distributed and will be used by projects which will be completed this summer.

1. CHEMISTRY COMPUTER WORKSHOP $ 700
Program Director--Mark Hughes

This program provides an opportunity for the Chemistry Department to gain expertise in the various applications of the computer to their teaching. After such a workshop, the use of the computer can add greatly to the quality of instruction as well as add various modes of learning.

2. RESEARCH PROJECTS IN FIELD BIOLOGY $ 2,100
Program Director--Norman Ford

This program is a continuation of the one funded for the 1974-75 year. The funds allow the research to continue during the Summer, 1975.

3. FOREIGN LANGUAGE VIDEO TAPES $ 6,000
Program Director--Otmar Drekonja

This program provides the development of a video tape library to support existing courses and to help make the students of Saint John's familiar with the latest affairs, events, and issues of the German scene.

4. MATHEMATICS NUMERICAL ANALYSIS $ 1,700
Program Director--John Lange

This program seeks to establish a course outline and materials necessary for making Numerical Analysis available through the "Directed Studies" program, using various computer programs.

5. PRINCETON INDEX $ 3,456
Program Director--Julian Plante

This program consists of acquiring the research and cataloging tools of the Princeton Index of Christian Art for Saint John's Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library.

6. ANTHROPOLOGY SLIDE SET $ 2,373
Program Director--Khalil Nakhleh

This program is to develop a set of slide packages with accompanying interpretations on the various cultural customs and institutions from different cultural areas (e.g., Middle East, Oceania, American culture, etc.). These packages will then be available to the students in various introductory classes.

7. TEACHER INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, PHASE I $ 3,850
Program Director--Joseph Friedrich

This program is the first phase of a two-part program which is designed to develop a means of managing courses with large numbers of students in a manner more conducive to intellectual progress and individualized personal education.

8. INSTRUCTIONAL DIALOGUE FACILITY FOR GENERAL PHYSICS $ 4,300
Program Director--Leonard Valley

This program provides learning modules in the IDF language of the computer for use in various areas of the physics curriculum.

9. NEAR EASTERN HISTORY STUDIES $ 5,300
Program Director--Father Alberic Culhane

This program involves the development of a series of slide lectures on the archaeology, history, and geography of the Near East. This series will enhance the instruction of the Bible as well as be a resource for courses in Near Eastern Studies.

10. AMERICAN SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY $ 4,180
Program Director--Father Kieran Nolan

This program consists of developing a program of readings, lectures, films, and guest speakers on the area of American Social Responsibility.

PROJECTS FOR THE 1975-76 YEAR:

NOTE: These projects are currently getting underway and are to be completed by 30 June 1976.

1. SYSTEMATIC IMPROVEMENT OF BIOLOGY III LABORATORY INSTRUCTION $ 13,250
Program Directors--Sister Dunstan Plantenberg, Sister Mary Grell, Ms. Billie Reaney

This program is a continuation of the program of the same name listed under the projects for the 1974-75 year.

2. SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT $ 5,000
Program Director--Mark Hughes

This program involves the acquisition of scientific equipment for the Chemistry Department to complement the current holdings and allow for the upgrading of the curriculum in the area of senior research.

3. COMPUTER TECHNIQUES IN MATHEMATICS $ 1,500
Program Director--Gerald Lenz

This program calls for three steps: 1) to investigate the topics of Statistics for which the computer is appropriate; 2) to design appropriate computer programs for the topics identified in 1); 3) to plan for the implementation of those programs in Statistics.

4. RURAL MINISTRY PROGRAM $ 8,000
Program Director--Father Blane Wasnie

This program expects the following outcomes: 1) organized data base of needs and role/activities of rural ministers in the area served by Saint John's School of Divinity; 2) specifications for a program to meet the demands of the data base; 3) specifications for the rural ministry program (course syllabi, skills required, and other related materials).

5. IMPROVEMENT OF THE HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS $ 1,125
Program Director--Gerald Lenz

This program is a continuation of the program of the same name listed under the projects for the 1974-75 year.

6. TEACHER INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, PHASE II $ 800
Program Director--Joseph Friedrich

This program is the second phase of the program of the same name listed under the projects for Reallocated Funds.

7. INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION — $ 22,750
Program Director--Joseph Friedrich

This program is a re-organization of the program of the same name listed under the project for the 1974-75 year.

8. SUMMER SLIDE PROGRAM IN HISTORY — $ 3,240
Program Director--Father Job Dittberner

This program involves the development of sets of slides which will be used to supplement course and individual learning offerings in histroy.

9. LANGUAGE LABORATORY TAPE COLLECTION — $ 1,800
Program Director--Father John Kulas

This program calls for the transfer of the present language lab tape collection to the cassette format. Tapes can then be made available to students in the library instead of the language laboratory.

10. INAUGURATION OF A LEARNING AND RESOURCE CENTER — $ 4,750
Program Director--Father Gordan Tavis

This program is a continuation of the program of the same name listed under the projects for the 1974-75 year.

11. COMPUTER ASSISTED STUDIES — $ 19,600
Program Director--James Peters

This program is a continuation of the program of the same name listed under the projects for the 1974-75 year.

12. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM — $ 4,925
Program Director--Sister Mary Anthony Wagner

This program is to develop a workable curriculum for the program in Religious Education.

13. SOCIOLOGY RESOURCES — $ 500

This program is collecting and organizing materials to produce a student resources center for the Sociology Department.

14. C & PD GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
Program Director--Michal Clark — $ 5,000

This program is a continuation of monitoring, evaluating, and assisting the program directors of the various C & PD projects.

TOTAL ALLOCATED FOR 1975-76 YEAR	$ 94,681
TOTAL YET TO BE ALLOCATED	$ 5,319
TOTAL	$100,000

APPENDIX B

C & PD QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS

Contents:

Questionnaire Results from
Persons Not Participating in
a Project
Questionnaire Results from
Project Participants.

SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY SURVEY ON CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT *

September, 1975

Please consider carefully your responses to each item. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope, no later than September 12, 1975, to:

Fr. Gunther Rolfson
Academic Vice President
Saint John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota 56321

Thank you for your assistance.

1. Please indicate the year of your initial full-time appointment to the faculty of Saint John's University.

   Mean year of appointment: 1962.47

   standard deviation: 9.6

   19_____

N = 48

2. How familiar are you with the Curriculum and Program Development (C&PD) Program? (Check the appropriate response for the items below.)

	Have submitted a proposal	Understand the program but have never submitted a proposal	Heard of it but don't fully understand it	Never heard of it
C&PD Program	29%/	47%/	18%/	5%/

If you have never heard of the program, please stop at this point and return the questionnaire in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope. Thank you.

* This form was sent to 82 faculty and academic administrators who had never worked on a funded C & PD project. A total of 48 forms were returned. This form presents a summary of the responses. Entries are either mean response or percentage of respondents who selected the indicated response alternative.

22 3. If you have heard of this program but have never applied for a grant from it, please indicate the importance of the reasons (for your not having applied) listed below by checking the appropriate response.

1 Of no importance	2 Of some importance	3 Quite important	4 Very important	
___/	1.95/	___/	___/	Haven't felt the need to engage in special development projects.
___/	1.73/	___/	___/	Don't think the hassle of submitting a proposal is worth it.
___/	1.91/	___/	___/	Did not receive encouragement from department or college administration.
1.59/	___/	___/	___/	Did not understand how to proceed.
___/	1.95/	___/	___/	Probability of being awarded a grant is too small.
___/	1.77/	___/	___/	Have financed educational development project(s) through external funding agencies.
___/	___/	___/	3.33/	Other (please specify) Not enough time (N = 5)

4. The C&PD Program was initiated by the University as a result of generous funding provided by the Ober and Butler Foundations. These funds allowed for change through expansion and accretion. In light of the limited time period for the outside funding, what is your perception of the importance of these funds for educational development? Please indicate your preference by checking one of the following:

N = 33

54% The C&PD Program is more important than ever to help maintain the vitality of University programs through renewal and innovation.

39% It is important but it is even more important not to reduce resources needed to maintain existing programs in their present state.

3% Resources for the operation and development of instructional programs should be budgeted entirely in the teaching unit.

6% Other (please specify) _____

5. Below are listed three major purposes of a program such as C&PD for educational development. Please indicate both your level of agreement in principle with each purpose and your opinion of the actual current effectiveness of the program in addressing the purpose by checking the appropriate response.

	AGREEMENT					EFFECTIVENESS				
	Strongly agree 5	Agree 4	Indifferent 3	Disagree 2	Strongly disagree 1	Very effective 5	Effective 4	Mediocre 3	Ineffective 2	Very ineffective 1
To establish formally the University responsibility for the improvement of educational practice.	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
			4.39					3.55		
To insure to all units of the University the availability of appropriately flexible resources for development of educational programs.	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
			4.51					3.59		
To provide for a planned, systematic and open procedure for the development of University educational programs.	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
			4.31					2.74		

6. Do you wish to receive a summary of the results of this study?

___ Yes ___ No

Thank you for taking the time to assist us in this evaluation effort. If you have any questions, please contact Michal Clark (612-363-2748).

Please return this completed questionnaire by September 12, 1975.

SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY SURVEY ON CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT *

September, 1975

Please consider carefully your responses to each item. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope, no later than September 12, 1975, to:

Fr. Gunther Rolfson
Academic Vice President
Saint John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota 56321

Thank you for your assistance.

SECTION I. GENERAL INFORMATION

N = 17 1. Please indicate the year of your initial full-time appointment to the faculty of Saint John's University.

Mean year of appointment: 1965.07

standard deviation: 6.87

19_____

N = 16 2. How many proposals have you submitted to the Curriculum and Program Development (C&PD) Program? 25 (total)

N = 16 3. How many of these have been funded? 23 (total)

N = 16 4. How many proposals have you submitted to outside agencies? 36 (total)

N = 16 5. How many of those have been funded? 15 (total)

N = 17 6. The C&PD Program was initiated by the University as a result of generous funding provided by the Ober and Butler Foundations. These funds allowed for change through expansion and accretion. In light of the limited time period for the outside funding, what is your perception of the importance of these funds for educational development? Please indicate your preference by checking one of the following:

53% The C&PD Program is more important than ever to help maintain the vitality of University programs through renewal and innovation.

41% It is important but it is even more important not to reduce resources needed to maintain existing programs in their present state.

0 Resources for the operation and development of instructional programs should be budgeted entirely in the teaching unit.

6% Other (please specify) _____

* This form was sent to 24 faculty and academic administrators who had worked on a funded C & PD project. A total of 17 forms were returned. This form presents a summary of the responses. Entries are either mean response to an item or percentage of respondents who selected the response alternative.

7. Below are listed three major purposes of a program such as C&PD for educational development. Please indicate both your level of agreement in principle with each purpose and your opinion of the actual current effectiveness of the program in addressing the purpose by checking the appropriate response.

N = 16

	AGREEMENT					EFFECTIVENESS				
	Strongly agree 5	Agree 4	Indifferent 3	Disagree 2	Strongly disagree 1	Very effective 5	Effective 4	Mediocre 3	Ineffective 2	Very ineffective 1
To establish formally the University responsibility for the improvement of educational practice.	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
			4.31					3.80		
To insure to all units of the University the availability of appropriately flexible resources for development of educational programs.	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
			4.69					3.87		
To provide for a planned, systematic and open procedure for the development of University educational programs.	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/	_/
			4.50					3.53		

SECTION II. PROJECT INFORMATION

N = 17 8. Please indicate the source of funds for the project reported on here:

14 (total) C&PD Program (total)3 Other (please specify) NSF or departmental funds

N = 16 9. What condition(s) suggested the need for educational development? Please rate the importance of the conditions listed below.

IMPORTANCE 1 No	2 Slight	3 Moderate	4 Great	
1.80	_/	_/	_/	Student dissatisfaction with a course or program.
2.33	_/	_/	_/	Peer or colleague dissatisfaction with a course or program.
2.75	_/	_/	_/	A change in departmental procedure or emphasis.
2.47	_/	_/	_/	A change in college procedure or emphasis.
2.47	_/	_/	_/	A visceral feeling.
1.53	_/	_/	_/	Decreasing enrollments.
2.50	_/	_/	_/	A change in, or addition to, my field, discipline, or profession.
2.00	_/	_/	_/	Hearing about success with the idea elsewhere.
3.06	_/	_/	_/	A change or improvement in instructional technology.
1.13	_/	_/	_/	A low rating by an accrediting body.
3.25	_/	_/	_/	Other (please specify) increased enrollment

N = 15 10. How important were the following in influencing your thinking regarding the development project? (Use the same rating scale as above.)

1 N	2 S	3 M	4 G	
3.47	_/	_/	_/	Discussions with discipline-related colleagues (at the University or elsewhere).
1.68	_/	_/	_/	Discussions with individuals in supportive fields (e.g. media specialists, education specialists, etc.).
2.87	_/	_/	_/	Discussions with students.

10. (Continued)

	N	S	M	G	
1.46	/	/	/	/	A paper read at a professional meeting.
2.47	/	/	/	/	An article in a discipline-related journal.
1.78	/	/	/	/	An article in an education journal.
1.93	/	/	/	/	A book or monograph.
1.46	/	/	/	/	Student evaluation.
	/	/	/	/	Other (please specify) _____

N = 15 11. How important were the following circumstances in stimulating you to apply for a C&PD project? (Use the same rating scale as in Items 9 & 10.)

	N	S	M	G	
3.07	/	/	/	/	Encouraged by departmental or collegiate administrators.
2.64	/	/	/	/	Recommended by colleagues.
2.71	/	/	/	/	Lack of available money from other funding agencies.
3.20	/	/	/	/	Lack of available money from regular departmental or collegiate sources.
3.47	/	/	/	/	Stimulated by the announcement of availability of funds from this program.
1.93	/	/	/	/	Encouraged by hearing of a colleague's funded project.
	/	/	/	/	Other (please specify) _____ _____

N = 13 12. Did your success in obtaining this grant affect in any way your standing within your department?

15% Yes 70% No 15% undecided

N = 15 13. Are the developmental aspects of this project completed?

27% Yes 73% No

14. Which of the following descriptions best characterizes the present state of the results of your project?

N = 16

31% continued in original form

12% reduced in scope and continued

56% expanded and continued

0 curtailed

___ other (please specify) _____

Please comment: Stimulation of interest in colleagues outside SJU; more student onvolvement; computer program library is growing; all-department plan has been reduced to more managable level; not as much progress as intended.

15. To your knowledge are the results of this development effort being used by other instructors:

N = 17

55% in your department 25% in other University departments 20% in other colleges or universities

Please comment:

16. Did this project produce any results which were not anticipated at the time it was conceived?

N = 12

50% positive 50% none _/ negative

Please comment: Made need for space; interdepartment agreement resulted; results will be used when numerical analysis course is taught again; large number of students caused revision in plan; bigger task than anticipated.

17. Was your conception of your discipline or profession changed in any way as a result of your efforts on this development project?

N = 16

44% Yes 56% No

Please comment: More aware of student needs in delivery of course; aware of other department members regarding material to be coveredl broadened by original conception; changed my future career plans; now know research is important at undergrad level; opens new expertise for me.

N = 14 18. Was your conception of education changed in any way as a result of your efforts on this project?

57% Yes 43% No

Please comment: Not materially, but in area of logistics; routine can be handled by computer; prerequisite planning should be part of faculty education; independent investigation is important; individual instruction isn't panacea for all ills.

19. In what ways has your work with the project contributed to either instructional effectiveness or efficiency? (check all that apply)

Entries are number of response

3/ more students learn subject	4/ students retain what they learn longer	1/ students learn same with less resource investment
9/ students learn something different	7/ students enjoy the experience more	1/ students learn same by working less

N = 13 20. In your judgment, what are the chances that this project would have been funded through other sources if it had not been funded through the C&PD Program?

___ no chance (1)

___ slim chance (2)

2.43 ___ 50-50 (3)

___ fairly certain (4)

___ virtual certainty (5)

N = 14 21. Have you experienced any difficulties regarding the management of your grant?

Entry = number of responses

1 Yes 13 No

Please comment (and indicate the source of difficulties if you do not mind):
Difficult to hire appropriate expert.

22. Do you wish to receive a summary of the results of this study?

86 Yes 14 No

Thank you for taking the time to assist us in this evaluation effort. If you have any questions, please contact Michal Clark (612-363-2748).

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope, no later than September 12, 1975, to:

Fr. Gunther Rolfson
Academic Vice President
Saint John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota 56321

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBER'S REPORTS

Contents:

Report from William Hickey, Academic Vice President, Saint Mary's College, South Bend, Indiana

Report from Gordon Kingston, Associate Director, Center for Educational Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Report from Bernard Luskin, Vice-Chancellor for Educational Development, Coast Community College District, Costa Mesa, California

SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
Collegeville, Minnesota

Evaluation Report on Curriculum and Program Development Program

October 16-17, 1975

William A. Hickey
December 4, 1975

The following report is being submitted by one member (William A. Hickey) of a three member team established to conduct an evaluation of the Curriculum and Program Development (C&PD) Program recently implemented at Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota. It should be noted that the purpose of this evaluation visit was to assess the general impact of the program on the academic programs of the University, as well as to formulate recommendations designed to maximize the benefit of the program to the University for future years. It was not designed to evaluate specific projects in terms of their merits, though quite obviously, some of the recommendations arise from discussions of these projects.

Prior to our visit to the campus, Dr. Michal Clark, Coordinator of the C&PD Program provided us with copies of the original proposal, the evaluation plan, a listing with short descriptions of the projects funded during the 1974-75 academic year, the results of several campus surveys on the program, and a number of procedural documents that had been developed internally for use by the faculty and appropriate University committees. Following a thorough study of these materials and in preparation for our visit, I formulated a number of questions which provided the basis for my discussion with campus personnel. Later in this report, I shall refer to certain of these questions, since the responses received were, in large part, responsible for some of the final recommendations being proposed.

During our time on the campus, we had the opportunity to meet and talk individually with a number of administrators, faculty (both those involved

in funded programs and those not involved), students, and staff. In addition, we were provided with an opportunity to participate in several group discussions, including one with several members of the Academic Affairs Advisory Council, the Council responsible for the development of proposal guidelines, the reviewing of all proposals, and the awarding of funds.

The specific report which follows addresses itself to these areas:

1. General Campus Impact of the Program
2. Specific Areas of Concern
3. Commendations and Recommendations

1. General Campus Impact of the Program

In the original proposal, a stated primary aim of the program was to provide a mechanism whereby the entire faculty could become involved in meaningful curricular reform. This reform would presumably result in a gradual changing of the curriculum designed to meet the goals set by Saint John's and to keep Saint John's in step with the rapidly changing demands on higher education.

When one considers that this program is just entering its second year, the results already realized suggest considerable success. Most members of the campus community are very supportive of the general thrust of the program. Survey results suggest that the majority of faculty are aware of the program and its major purposes. Indeed, our discussions left the distinct impression that faculty are quite excited about the program, since it provides them with a real opportunity to do more than just talk about curricular reform. In fact,

several members indicated that prior to the availability of C&PD funds, there was little University encouragement for substantial change. This, of course, is not too surprising in view of the rapidly increasing costs being experienced by all private institutions of higher education. It was most significant to find this enthusiastic support for the program, even from faculty who do not presently have projects funded. Perhaps some of the more satisfying comments were received from several of the students who have already realized the educational benefits resulting from several of the projects. The students were not only pleased with their experiences, but, pointed out, that in some instances, the faculty seemed more excited about their academic work. The latter result, of course, would, in itself, be sufficient reason for judging these initial efforts a success.

2. Specific Areas of Concern

As with any new and ambitious program, an administrator must anticipate that problems will certainly occur. It is most important that these be identified early, studied and eliminated in order to ensure maximum benefit from the program. In our discussions regarding the C&PD Program, a number of such problems and concerns emerged which could, if left unattended, result in a considerable weakening of the long-range program impact. I should add at the outset, that none of the problems were totally unexpected and all can easily be addressed and eliminated by serious efforts on the part of appropriate administration and faculty.

The discussions, which led to the identification of specific areas of concern, were based on a series of questions which had been formulated earlier. Some of the questions raised were:

a. Was the faculty involved in the development of the original proposal?

b. Was the faculty supportive of the major program purposes and the main areas stressed in the proposal?

c. Was the faculty aware of the general availability of the funds?

d. Was the faculty fully informed of the guidelines to be followed in the submission of proposals?

e. Was the faculty aware of and supportive of the criteria to be used in the selection of projects for funding?

f. Was the faculty aware of the "evaluative mechanism" designed to judge whether programs would receive funding on a continuing basis?

g. What procedures have been developed to make available to other institutions information on successful projects?

h. What, if any, procedures have been developed to provide faculty with support needed to undertake the more difficult type of project? (By support here was meant: modification of "normal" faculty workload, provision of student aids, assistance of clerical and/or professional staff, opportunity to visit colleagues working on similar projects in other institutions, etc.)

i. Was the faculty aware of University commitment for future funding of successful innovations?

   1.) How was this to be accomplished?
   2.) Who would make the decisions and what role was the faculty to have in determining the mechanism?

j. Were contract mechanisms available, either at the departmental or university level, to provide for an orderly response in areas such as:

1.) addition or deletion of courses in a departmental curriculum,

2.) development of new course sequences or, more importantly, new programs?

(This question was an attempt to make certain some structure existed, involving faculty input, which would prevent major changes from just happening.)

k. Was the faculty kept fully informed of projects funded?

As indicated, these kinds of questions were designed to assist us in gaining more detailed reactions to the program and any changes that might be necessary to enhance the chances for long-range and continuing impact on curricular reform at Saint John's. The observations which follow deal only with the two areas that emerged as important in the minds of a number of individuals interviewed.

Perhaps the most significant concern expressed by most individuals was related to the University's commitment to provide continued funding for this program in curricular reform. Few were aware of any clear statement which would, not only ensure continued funding, but also state clearly whether these funds would result from a shift of resources from one program to another, or would represent additional new funding. Moreover, concern was expressed regarding faculty input into the decision making process, especially as it relates to the conduct of evaluations designed to make decisions on decreased funding for certain of the present programs.

Information received from the President and discussion with other key administrators suggest that this rather widespread concern is unfounded. There not only seems to be a firm commitment for continued funding, but it is apparent that the Academic Affairs Advisory Council is intended to play a major role in the formulation of recommendations regarding programs to be cut back, strengthened, etc. Thus, lack of communication is clearly responsible for some of the concern in this instance. However, I should add, that no precise system for the reallocation of funds from one academic area to another, or from the non-academic area to the academic area was described to the evaluation team members. Clearly, if one does not presently exist, it should be immediately formulated and communicated to the faculty.

The area of second greatest concern that emerged from our discussions was the general feeling that the program lacked sufficient structure and direction and that, indeed, certain program goals were not being realized. This observation stems from a series of comments dealing with the absence of well stated, detailed guidelines, along with a structured format for proposal submission, unclear criteria on which proposal selection is made, how a number of the projects funded either, addressed themselves to the major program purposes, or were of any long-range significance, on what basis an evaluation was going to be conducted in order to determine whether the project would continue to receive funding, general lack of direction from the Academic Affairs Advisory Council, etc.

There is complete agreement among the President and his key administrators regarding the need for additional staff support in the general overall handling of the program. I do not think any of the early difficulties are too surprising, given the untimely death of the former Vice President for Academic Affairs, the person who was the primary force behind the original program. However, more staff time, in itself, will not resolve all of the concerns expressed. While members of the Academic Affairs Advisory Council (AAAC) are quick to point out their role in administering the C&PD Program, some members are unclear as to how much authority they have to recommend changes. The AAAC is clearly the body that should now take a hard look at the program in order to determine where the institution is and to set clear cut general directions for future curricular change. In addition, the AAAC should develop a more precise mechanism for proposal submission, with specific criteria for proposal evaluation and should clearly communicate this to the institution. I rather suspect that in order to accomplish the above, the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs are going to have to play a more active role in the next phase of this program.

Finally, the concern for the rather diverse array of projects funded and the absence of any long range implications on the part of some of these is perhaps unwarranted. Indeed, the strategy adopted by the institution to simply throw the program open, in an effort to get as much faculty interest and involvement as possible seems to have paid off.

Clearly, few members of the faculty are not aware of the program and most seem to feel quite good about the opportunities provided by such a program. Obviously, now, after the first year, is the time to move toward a structured, systematic approach to curricular reform.

3. Commendations and Recommendations

The University should clearly be commended for:

a. The courage to undertake a program which will clearly have a positive impact on the academic programs.

b. The good will and cooperation of all constituents which is so essential for the effective conduct of this program.

c. The supportive role of many faculty in recognizing the potential benefits of such a program.

d. The fine work, thus far, of the Academic Affairs Advisory Council in the first and most difficult year for the program.

e. The excellent results produced by the faculty whose projects were funded during the first year of the C&PD Program.

The following recommendations are being presented for consideration by the University:

a. The formulation of a clearer role for the AAAC is essential, including a clear delineation of their responsibilities and authorities.

b. The AAAC should redefine the major program goals in light of the first year's experience and establish clear directions of the program for the next few years.

c. AAAC, working with appropriate administrative officers, should develop guidelines for proposal submission and should articulate to the college community the criteria for selection.

d. In an effort to encourage greater and more meaningful departmental and faculty participation, consideration might be given to ideas such as:

1.) allocating a certain portion of the program money to an area where change is most needed (eg. within a division or department or between several departments),

2.) allocating a certain portion of the program money to specific types of curricular changes (eg. core curriculum, interdisciplinary courses, special liberal arts courses for applied majors, such as Business Ethics, etc.),

3.) allocating a certain portion of the program money for a specific topic, such as development of teaching materials, designing a system for course evaluation, providing a mechanism for faculty development, etc.,

4.) providing a "financial reward" for the proposal that effects the most significant change,

5.) provide faculty with greater opportunity to work on larger projects by establishing "teacher-in-residence" awards. Might be for one-quarter time course reduction and also would be a recognition for faculty,

6.) publish a listing of faculty projects judged most successful and provide them with an opportunity to discuss them with the college community,

7.) for department proposals that increase productivity, offer to return a percentage of the saving to the department for their own use,

8.) allocating a portion of the money for the design of workshops for faculty on topics such as: proposal writing, program evaluation, etc.

e. Regarding the long range implications of the program, the Vice President for Academic Affairs should communicate early:

1.) system of evaluation to be used in determining project effectiveness,

2.) how decisions will be made, and by whom, regarding programs and courses to be retained, eliminated, etc.

f. The President should restate the University's commitment to continued program funding and should describe the system to be used in determing the reallocation of funds from one academic program to another and from the non-academic area to the academic area.

g. The University should appoint a Coordinator (at least half-time) to the Program with sufficient status in the academic community to carry out the major responsibilities.

h. The responsibilities and decision making authorities of the Coordinator must be clearly defined, as should the role of the coordinator with the AAAC. This would be best accomplished by the President or the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. Summary

The Curriculum and Program Development Program at Saint John's has clearly had a positive impact on the academic community. Considering that C&PD has been operative for only one year, the number of faculty involved, projects submitted, and results achieved are considerable. There would seem to be every reason to expect even greater results in future years, assuming the continued efforts and cooperation of administration and faculty. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that this is already occurring when one considers the increased number of proposals being submitted this year and the general catalytic effect of certain successful projects from last year.

Saint John's is to be commended for its efforts and encouraged to continue this most important task of curriculum and program development.

December 8, 1975

Gordon Wm. Kingston, Ph.D.
Center for Educational Development
University of Minnesota

Report on the Evaluation of the Curriculum and Program Development Program at Saint John's University

The Curriculum and Program Development Program (C and PD) is based upon the recommendation of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (More Effective Use of Resources, 1973) that colleges and universities set aside a fixed percentage of their operating budgets for purposes relating to innovation and renewal. It is an extension of the industrial model by which research and development functions are supported from corporate profits. Like many of the Carnegie Commission recommendations, this one was overlooked by most colleges and universities. However, a number of forward-looking institutions--including St. John's University--recognized the essential value of the notion and undertook its implementation. It is a decision which will likely hold the institution in good stead while other colleges and universities experience the renewal-debilitating effects of retrenchment.

The C and PD Program was initiated with the assistance of funding from the Ober Foundation and Butler Foundation. The plan is for external support to decrease to zero over a five year span while St. John's increases its own internal support to maintain funding at a level equal to five percent of the

University's education and general expenditures. A total of nine projects were supported in the first year of operation (1974-75); three of these projects were later delayed and an additional ten projects replaced them. Thus, a total of 16 projects were supported in 1974-75. In 1975-76, a total of 13 projects were funded.

Based upon discussions with faculty members responsible for funded projects, the program has so far proven extremely successful. These individuals appear to have assimilated the purposes of the C and PD program and their projects appear to be well conceived and managed and of uniformly high quality. Similarly, discussions with faculty members not involved with projects evidenced concern for continuation of the program and a willingness to be of assistance in guaranteeing its future. Representatives of the University administration were mostly supportive of the program and its outcomes to date. All of these individuals appeared to have a good understanding of the purposes of the program and offered suggestions for improvement. Only one individual voiced a concern regarding St. John's ability to continue the program beyond the initial grant period.

Prior to the visit of the evaluation team, Dr. Michal Clark, coordinator of the C and PD Program, distributed a questionnaire to the faculty which sought information regarding their support for the program. The responses to the survey showed a high degree of faculty support for the program and a high level of faculty understanding for the purposes of the program.

The C and PD Program clearly benefits from the following conditions:

* a positive commitment from the University leadership to the notion of planned, systematic educational change;
* a high degree of support from the faculty and administration for continuation of the program;
* a clear statement from the institution specifying its joint responsibility with the faculty for improvement of educational practice;
* positive, creative leadership from the coordinator of the C and PD Program, the Academic Vice President, and others involved in coordination of the program.

The evidence is overwhelming that the program has both created an atmosphere accepting of change and promoted the development of new programs that are well-planned and managed.

Evaluation Visit

On October 16 and 17, three external evaluators visited the campus of St. John's University. The evaluation visit was well-planned and organized by the Coordinator of the C and PD program to derive maximum benefit. Listed in Appendix A are the documents reviewed by the writer both in advance and subsequent to the visit and a list of the individuals interviewed during the visit.

Recommendations

1. Given the institutional support for the program from all sectors and the

evidence of the utility of the projects supported through the program, the Curriculum and Program Development Program should be continued. The balance of the recommendations are suggestions for improving its functioning.

2. The President, in consultation with the faculty and other members of the administration, should develop a firm financial plan for the program, spanning, perhaps, the next seven to ten years. A program such as this one is only successful to the extent that the faculty are confident of its continuing support--both philosophical and financial. Such a plan would put to rest any faculty concerns about the continuity of the program and allow it to become part of the ongoing commitment of St. John's to innovation and renewal.

3. A number of issues relating to programmatic emphases would benefit from policy discussion. To organize such discussion, a committee of the faculty should be assembled. This committee might serve both to develop policy for the program and to review proposals in subsequent rounds of the program. One of the issues which surfaces in any program like C and PD is "ownership." There seems to be at least a slight confusion regarding this issue at St. John's. In the future, the main policy discussions and recommendations for project support should take place in a committee comprising faculty members. Their recommendations for both policy and project support should be forwarded to the Academic Vice President for disposition. A number of policy issues appear to need resolution. One of these has to do with what might be called the "institutional development

portfolio." For example, the University needs to decide how much funding will go to "high risk" investments (broadly innovative, new ventures) as opposed to "low risk" investments (renewal of existing programs). The University needs to determine, too, the conditions under which it will support planning efforts as opposed to efforts at the stage of implementation. The faculty committee should attempt to define and clarify, for the purposes of the program, the kinds of development which are appropriate: curriculum development, faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development. Finally the committee should draft a statement on development (risk investment for innovation and renewal) and operation (ongoing support of tested ideas) and clarify, precisely, the role of the program with respect to each. Further, the responsibility of the academic department in the post-development phase should be clearly stated.

4. Some considerations should be given to identifying University wide "themes" for development projects in a given year. There is some evidence that this has already been done, at least minimally. In other words, the tie between University planning and the C and PD should be strengthened. Care should be taken, however, that reasonable flexibility remains; proposals not directly addressing the theme(s) for a given year should also be accepted for review. Themes should be used to focus, but not limit, development efforts.

5. A number of operating suggestions are here offered for consideration:

A. the work of the faculty committee should be written up in the form of guidelines and distributed to the faculty in a brochure (see Appendix B);

B. at least two, and preferably three, months should be allowed from the time a given round of competition is announced and the deadline date for receipt of proposals;

C. to aid in proposal writing, a proposal form (or outline) should be prepared and circulated to the faculty (see Appendix C);

D. faculty should be encouraged to consult with the Development Director during the proposal writing stage (Note: his role should be facilitative and technical, not judgmental);

E. faculty should be encouraged to consult with other on-campus experts (e.g., learning resource center personnel and educational psychologists) for assistance in writing;

6. The obligations of the grant recipients for evaluation of their projects should be clarified and stated for each project at the time of the award. Obviously, not every project will require a full-blown evaluation. However, especially for the larger projects evaluation responsibilities and expectations should be clear.

7. The University should organize a vehicle for publicizing the results of funded projects both on- and off-campus. Faculty engaged in development activities should be recognized for their efforts and other colleges and

universities would benefit from hearing of the St. John's experience. Perhaps a newsletter edited by the C and PD Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the Development Office, would be appropriate.

8. Finally, St. John's University should substantially increase its investment in the management and coordination of the C and PD Program. The current coordinator has done an excellent (even remarkable) job of keeping the program operating. As the program extends into additional years, a 20 percent commitment of time will no longer be reasonable. An increase to 75 percent for next year and full-time the year following is recommended as a minimum. Further, the relationship of the coordinator to the policy and review committee and the Academic Vice President should be clearly stated.

St. John's University has succeeded in developing a program which should prove extremely successful in both anticipating the future and adjusting to its demands. In the coming decade the Curriculum and Program Development program might well prove to be the difference between excellence and stagnation, between survival and decay. Your success with this program may well aid other colleges in meeting the future. Your responsibility for sharing your experience with them is clear.

Appendix A

Documents Reviewed

1. "A Plan for Systematic Curriculum and Program Development" (Proposal to the Ober Foundation). Dated March 3, 1973.

2. "Systematic Curriculum and Program Development at Saint John's University: A Progress Report." No date.

3. "Curriculum and Program Development Activities." No date.

4. "Guidelines for Curriculum and Program Development Programs." A memorandum from the Academic Vice President, dated March 4, 1975.

5. "Additional C and PD Fund Availability." A memorandum from the Academic Vice President; dated March 17, 1975.

6. "An Evaluation Plan for Curriculum and Program Development at Saint John's University." No date.

7. "Saint John's University 1973 Summer Planning Committee Report and Recommendations." Dated August 15, 1973.

8. "The Saint John's Plan of Liberal Education." Dated February, 1974.

9. "Projects for the 1975-76 Year." No date.

10. Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Apparis Advisory Council, meetings 18 and 19, April 9 and 16, 1975.

11. Summary statistics of the evaluation questionnaire. September, 1975.

12. Memorandum from Fr. Michael Blecker, President, in response to questions posed by the evaluation team, dated October 28, 1975.

Interviews

1. Michal Clark, C and PD Program.
2. Lee Hanley, Development Director.
3. Ali Hakam, International Administration Program.
4. S. Dunstan Plantenberg, S. Mary Grell, Billie Reaney, Biology Laboratory Program
5. James Krile, Rural Ministry Program.
6. Fr. John Kules and Otmar Drekonja, German Videotape Project.
7. Lynn Bryce, Manuscript Microfilm Project.
8. Fr. Gunther Rolfson, Academic Vice President.
9. Edward Henry, Vice President for Development.

Additional faculty and staff were engaged in conversation about the C and PD at lunch on both days of the evaluation visit.

75-OEPD-BJL-697

Coast Community College district

1370 ADAMS AVENUE • COSTA MESA • CALIFORNIA 92626

(714) 556-5606

NORMAN E. WATSON - CHANCELLOR

November 12, 1975

Dr. Michal C. Clark
St. John's University
Collegeville, MN 56321

Dear Dr. Clark:

I am pleased to be able to assist with your evaluation of the CD&P program at St. John's University and was pleased to spend October 16 and 17 on your campus reviewing your programs.

I have examined the materials you provided in addition to conducting the elaborate series of personal interviews which were arranged. Dr. Blecker has responded with a letter setting forth his perception of the program, and I have now pulled these together into a summary report of the visit.

The CD&P program has the potential for success. The start-up funding for programs now in process shows high possibilities of integration into the curriculum. There seemed to be some vagueness on the part of the faculty as to whether funding would be continued in the future and some confusion as to what the specific guidelines for project development are. This is more a communications problem than a real problem, as the interviews seemed to indicate an administrative commitment to follow through with the program and to accommodate an increased funding level as the program grant diminishes.

Below is a list of several specific suggestions which may prove useful:

1. There is a need for clear and definitive guidelines which spell out proposal missions, objectives, and insure the potential of program success.

2. Primary administrative responsibilities should be designated to an authoritative administrator responsible for administering the program. A weakness in the program at present is an absence of definite responsibility for its development.

3. A statement of institutional commitment would prove valuable to the faculty.

4. Projects which have the earmarks of success and expansion should be visibly reinforced with the intention of inclusion in the regular program.

5. The Academic Affairs Council should come to agreement over what the guidelines are. My suggestion would be to support several types of projects--for example, FOCUS projects, experimental, developmental, and impact projects, each having a specific purpose in relation to the educational program.

6. Institutional priorities should be articulated and projects submitted to be consistent with institutional goals. Both leadership and visibility should highlight the program, as it has great potential for institutional development.

7. Several pertinent comments on the program which emerged in the interviews are:

   a. "People have good ideas but not necessarily the competency to carry them through. They need assistance."

   b. "Not a faculty development program."

   c. "The CD&P program should focus on new ways of teaching."

In summary, there was a feeling expressed for the need for an articulated commitment from top administration, guidelines which are more clear, expression of institutional goals for the program, establishment of primary responsibility for its administration, and an increase in efforts at communication so that faculty understand the program and what is happening more clearly.

Dr. Blecker noted repeatedly in his response a need for systematic impact in continuing to provide for individual differences and creative adaptation of the educational program to student social needs. He noted that innovative and creative approaches are desirable and expressed commitment to that end.

Overall the program has the earmarks of success. Its strength is in the conceptual validity and in the high interest of the faculty in improving their instructional programs and in taking advantage of CD&P opportunities. The program should be continued, supported, and reinforced and, over the long run, has the potential of making a significant contribution to the improvement of the instructional program at St. John's University.

If I can provide any additional assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Bernard J. Luskin
Vice Chancellor
Educational Planning and Development

BJL/bjo

APPENDIX D

1976-77 PROJECT APPLICATION MATERIALS

Contents:

Memo Announcing Funding Cycle
Guidelines for 1976-77 C & PD Funding
Grant Application Form
Suggestions for Completing Grant Application Form

TO: All Faculty

FROM: Fr. Gunther Rolfson, O.S.B.

DATE: February 3, 1976

RE: 1976-77 C & PD Fund Availability

Time has come again to consider C & PD project funding for the next academic year. We will have approximately $70,000 available to support new projects. If you are interested in proposing a project for funding, you must complete a C & PD Grant Application form and submit it to my office before March 10. Application forms are available from my office or from the C & PD Coordinator's office(S.L. 213-B). Although proposals should be as brief and to the point as possible, writers may occasionally need more space than provided on the application form. You may append pages as necessary for the various items. The attached guidelines should be helpful to you in formulating your project. The guidelines reflect several of the recommendations of the evaluation team that visited the campus last fall to review our C & PD function and to help assure its efficiency and viability.

If you are interested in applying for C & PD funds, I urge you to talk with Michal Clark or Lee Hanley and make use of their assistance in completing the application process. I understand there are a number of helpful guides for proposal writing available to you in the Communications Office.

I encourage you to apply for these funds to support relevant projects of interest to you. I appreciate your interest in this program in the past and I enthusiastically anticipate the beginning of another successful year of C & PD projects.

All proposals will be presented to the AAAC for consideration soon after March 10 and we hope to be able to announce the awarding of C & PD Grants by mid-April.

The essence of the C & PD Program is to enable the university to respond to new curriculum and program proposals as promptly as possible. The program can fund educational development proposals which aim to improve academic quality and/or to increase productivity in the teaching-learning process. Two major goals of the program are:

1.) to support innovative or new programs which have potential promise for the University and

2.) to encourage relevant and responsible experimentation in liberal studies oriented education.

For 1976-77 funding consideration the following specific details apply:

1. A C & PD Grant Application form must be submitted to the Academic Vice President's Office by March 10, 1976. Completion of the application form replaces the writing of a proposal. Application forms are available from Fr. Gunther's Office and from Michal Clark's Office(S.L. 213-B).

2. Applicants are encouraged to read "The Guide for Writing Proposals" available from Lee Hanley in the Communications Office(Q149). Utilization of the proposal preparation resourses available through the Communications Office(Q149) and the C & PD Coordinator's Office(S.L.213-B) is encouraged in completion of the application forms.

3. Projects may be supported by C & PD funds for 1, 2 or 3 years. If you request multiple year funding, your application form should describe first year activities in detail and it should also outline second and third year budgets.

4. Funding decisions will be made by the Academic Affairs Advisory Council. The AAAC will select projects to be funded and will make decisions on the total funding for each funded project.

5. The Academic Vice President will announce the awarding of funds by mid-April.

6. The following criteria will be considered by AAAC in reaching funding decisions:

   a.) The project must address some educationally relevant need;

   b.) The project must be innovative or experimental(It need not be so in an absolute sense, but it should be a new step forward in the proposed area on our campus.);

   c.) The project must be capable of becoming self-sustaining after C & PD funding of it has terminated;

   d.) Projects which relate to some aspect of the University's developing liberal studies program will be given top priority;

   e.) Projects which contribute to systemmatic development of a promising program will be given priority;

f.) Application forms should be as specific as possible in describing the proposed project, its implementation and its evaluation.

7. The following information is relevant to your project's budget:

   a.) Faculty are paid $1,000 per month for summer work(This figure could be revised, but such revision would have to be made by AAAC.);

   b.) Other personnel are to be budgeted at current rates;

   c.) You should be realistic in your budgeting;

   d.) Once AAAC has negotiated your total project budget, the project director can revise the budget(remaining within the project total) to assure the most effective use of funds.

8. If you have any questions about the C & PD Program and/or the application process, please contact Michal Clark, the C & PD Coordinator(X 2748, S.L. 213-B.)

SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
APPLICATION FOR C & PD PROGRAM GRANT
Office of Academic Affairs

1. TITLE AND/OR SENTENCE DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

1A. PROJECT DIRECTORS:

2. BEING AS SPECIFIC AND INCLUSIVE AS POSSIBLE, DESCRIBE THE BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT IN WHICH YOUR PROPOSAL IS MADE AND THE NEED(S) IT IS INTENDED TO ADDRESS.

3. WHAT IS THE "STATE OF THE ART" IN THE AREA ADDRESSED BY YOUR PROPOSED PROGRAM? ARE YOU AWARE OF SUCCESSES/FAILURES OF SIMILAR PROGRAMS ELSEWHERE? COULD WHAT YOU PROPOSE BENEFIT FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF SIMILAR PROGRAMS ELSEWHERE?

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT: (Specify your goals or desired outcomes: Detail briefly each important step in the procedure.)

5. PRESENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM OF COURSE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSAL: (If course improvement, describe present course. If new method of presentation, describe method in current use. How does course relate to other courses and programs.

6. PLEASE LIST ALL UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS WHICH WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS PROJECT AND INDICATE THOSE WHICH HAVE BEEN CONSULTED IN PREPARING THIS APPLICATION.

7. PLEASE LIST ANY ADDITIONAL COURSES, PROGRAMS, OR OTHER ACTIVITIES AT SAINT JOHN'S OR ELSEWHERE, WHICH MIGHT BENEFIT FROM SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF YOUR PROJECT.

8. WHAT IMPROVEMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS DO YOU EXPECT TO RESULT FROM THE PROJECT AT SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY OR IN HIGHER EDUCATION GENERALLY?

9. HOW DO YOU PLAN TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT? BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE IN DESCRIBING QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION AND INCLUDE SUCH FACTORS AS COST/BENEFIT TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE. FORMS TO BE USED? INSIDE, OUTSIDE EVALUATIONS?

10. WHAT IS YOUR SPECIFIC PLAN FOR CONTINUED FUNDING FOR WHAT YOU PROPOSE AFTER C & PD FUNDING IS TERMINATED?

11. ARE THERE ANY HUMAN/PHYSICAL RESOURCE FACTORS WHICH WOULD MAKE APPROVAL OF THIS PROPOSAL PARTICULARLY TIMELY THIS YEAR?

NOTE: You may append any materials which might be helpful in explaining or justifying your project or complete your response to any ofthe preceding questions on additional pages as necessary.

12. BRIEF ABSTRACT OF PROPOSAL:

Office use only:
Rec.
Considered
Funded Amount
Not Funded
Reconsidered

13. APPLICANT(S): (Name, Position, Department or Unit)

14. NUMBER OF YEARS C & PD FUNDING REQUESTED

15. REQUESTED BUDGET(Append necessary detail) (NOTE: If multiyear project, submit a requested budget for each year.)

	% of time	Period(dates) of project work	Requested Amount	Matching Funds*	(Leave Blank)
A. Salaries					
Lay-Faculty					
OSB-Faculty					
Secretarial					
Student					
Other					
B. Consultants					
C. Travel					
D. Office Expenses(itemize if large)					
E. Equipment(itemize)					
F. Lab or A-V materials(itemize)					
G. Other(specify)					
H. Total Budget					

*Matching funds are monies available in your department budget(or elsewhere) which you will use to supplement C & PD monies for completing this project.

16. HAS THE C & PD PROGRAM SUPPORTED THIS OR RELATED PROJECTS IN THE PAST(if yes, identi the project(s) and idicate when it was supported) YES NO

17. DURATION OF PROJECT: FROM TO

18. SUBMITTED BY: (individual to contact with questions)

19. FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:

YES
NO
NAME (print or type)

Department Head
Signature Date

YES
NO
NAME(print or type)

AAAC Committee
Signature Date

YES
NO
NAME (print or type)

Academic Vice President
Signature Date

Form MCC 60123

Suggestions for Completing
Application for C & PD Program Grant Form

The following comments are intended to clarify the C & PD Program Grant application form. These are merely suggestions, but we hope they will answer many of your questions about completing the form. The comments are numbered the same as the items on the form. While your completed application form(proposal) should be as brief, concise and specific as possible, you may append any materials or information which will not fit in the space provided on the form.

1. Give a short title to your project. The title should be descriptive of what you are doing. It will be used as a brief identifier for your project. If you wish, you may also write a one sentence description of your project here.

2. A project which is to be successful should address a real need. Identify the need(s)-especially those relevant to an academic program within the university--which your program addresses.

3. Most proposed projects deal with developing a new program or innovation within the University. Frequently, the project's implement, refine or further develop a program here which has been patterned after or adapted from programs elsewhere. Identify and describe what you know about programs similar to the one you are proposing. If you need help in finding reference to other programs, please consult the C & PD Coordinator's office, the Communications Office and/or the Library.

4. Describe what you intend to do. Be as specific as you can.

5. Identify any activities or programs currently operating which your program would change, improve upon, etc. Relate your proposed project to what is currently being done.

6. & 7. Indentify any programs, departments, courses, etc. which would be affected or helped by your proposed project. Be sure and indicate which of these programs, departments, etc. which have been contacted in preparing this application.

8. Describe the benefits to the University which will result from the implementation of your project.

9. Describe how you intend to evaluate your project.

10. A requirement for C & PD funding is that the projects should be able to become self-sustaining after C & PD funding has been completed. Describe how your project could become self-sustaining. Any budgeted departmental matching funds will be viewed as a commitment to making the project self-sustaining.

11. Frequently, a particular set of factors make it more desirable to fund a certain project at a specific time. Describe any such factors which might make it particularly desirable to fund your project for next year.

12. Summarize your proposed project. This summary must take only the space provided.

13. Indicate the project director who will be the contact person for the project. List any other faculty participants in the project.

14. C & PD funding may be requested for up to three years. Indicate the number of years of funding you are requesting for your project. Note that a separate budget must be filled out for each year in a multiyear project. Also, for a multiyear project, your proposal should clearly indicate what will be completed in each year of the project.

15. Fill in your project budget. For "% of time" indicate the percent of time that personnel will be working on the project during the periods indicated. In the Matching Funds column, indicate any departmental, other grant or other supplementary funds which will be used to support your project. Be sure to indicate the source of any matching funds. There is no matching requirement for C & PD project funds. However, availability of any matching funds is a good indicator of commitment to the project. If you have questions on your budget, contact either Michal Clark of Lee Hanley.

16. & 17. Answer the questions asked.

18. Indicate who should be contacted in the event any questions arise concerning your proposal. This person will probably be the project director as indicated in item 1A, but it does not have to be.

19. You sould have your proposal signed by your department chairperson. That signature and his/her recommendation are required if any departmental funds are used for matching. Proposals which are not approved by the department head have a lower probability of being funded.

The AAAC Committee's and the Academic Vice President's recommendations will be made as a part of the proposal review process. So, leave those spaces blank.

Once you have completed the application form, submit one copy of the form along with any materials that you append to the Academic Vice President. It is advisable for you to keep a copy of your proposal. If you have any questions, contact the C & PD Coordinator and/or the Communications Office.